1		HONORABLE RICARDO S. MARTINEZ	
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA		
8			
9 10	LAWRENCE and SHANA HILL, a Washington marital community; UNITED SERVICES AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION, as subrogee	NO. 3:22-cv-5418-RSM	
11	of Lawrence and Shana Hill, a reciprocal inter- Insurance exchange,	DEFENDANT GREPOW, INC.'S ANSWER	
12	Plaintiff,	TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT	
13	VS.	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED	
14	GREPOW, INC., a California corporation,	JORT TRIAL DEMANDED	
15	Defendant.		
16			
17	COMES NOW, Defendant Grepow, Inc.	("Defendant Grepow"), by and through its	
18	undersigned counsel of record, and answers and responds to Plaintiffs' First Amended		
19	Complaint as follows:	•	
20			
21	I. <u>PARTIES</u>		
22	1. In answer to Paragraph 1 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow is		
23	without sufficient knowledge and information to form a belief as to the truth of the matters		
24	stated therein, and therefore denies the same.		
25	DEFENDANT GREPOW, INC.'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT - 1	FLOYD, PFLUEGER & RINGER P.S.  3101 Western Ave., Suite 400  SEATTLE, WA 98121-3019  TEL 206 441-4455	

FAX 206 441-8484

- 2. In answer to Paragraph 2 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow is without sufficient knowledge and information to form a belief as to the truth of the matters stated therein, and therefore denies the same.
- 3. In answer to Paragraph 3 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow is without sufficient knowledge and information to form a belief as to the truth of the matters stated therein, and therefore denies the same.
- 4. In answer to Paragraph 4 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow admits only that it is a California corporation and that its principal place of business is located at 290 Lindbergh Avenue, Livermore, California, 94551. As to all other allegations contained in Paragraph 4, Defendant Grepow denies all other allegations not specifically admitted.
- 5. In answer to Paragraph 5 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow admits only that it is engaged in business as a distributor of battery products. As to all other allegations contained in Paragraph 5, Grepow denies all other allegations not specifically admitted.

# II. <u>JURISDICTION AND VENUE</u>

- 6. In answer to Paragraph 6 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow incorporates its answers and responses to Paragraphs 1 through 5 above as though fully stated herein and denies all allegations not specifically admitted.
- 7. In answer to Paragraph 7 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow is without sufficient knowledge and information to form a belief as to the truth of the matters asserted therein, and therefore denies the same.

DEFENDANT GREPOW, INC.'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT - 2

- 8. In answer to Paragraph 8 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow objects to the extent that the allegations contained in Paragraph 8 consist of legal assertions and conclusions, to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendant Grepow denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 9. In answer to Paragraph 9 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow objects to the extent that the allegations contained in Paragraph 9 consist of legal assertions and conclusions, to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendant Grepow denies each and every allegation contained therein.

#### III. <u>FACTS</u>

- 10. In answer to Paragraph 10 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow incorporates its answers and responses to Paragraphs 1 through 9 above as though fully stated herein and denies all allegations not specifically admitted.
- 11. In answer to Paragraph 11 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow is without sufficient knowledge and information to form a belief as to the truth of the matters asserted therein, and therefore denies the same.
- 12. In answer to Paragraph 12 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow is without sufficient knowledge and information to form a belief as to the truth of the matters asserted therein, and therefore denies the same.
- 13. In answer to Paragraph 13 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow is without sufficient knowledge and information to form a belief as to the truth of the matters asserted therein, and therefore denies the same.

DEFENDANT GREPOW, INC.'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT - 3

14. In answer to Paragraph 14 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow is without sufficient knowledge and information to form a belief as to the truth of the matters asserted therein, and therefore denies the same.

15. In answer to Paragraph 15 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow is without sufficient knowledge and information to form a belief as to the truth of the matters asserted therein, and therefore denies the same.

16. In answer to Paragraph 16 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow is without sufficient knowledge and information to form a belief as to the truth of the matters asserted therein, and therefore denies the same.

17. In answer to Paragraph 17 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow objects to the extent that the allegations contained in Paragraph 17 contain legal assertions and conclusions, which require no response. To the extent a response is required, Defendant Grepow is without sufficient knowledge and information to form a belief as to the truth of the matters asserted therein, and therefore denies the same.

18. In answer to Paragraph 18 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow is without sufficient knowledge and information to form a belief as to the truth of the matters asserted therein, and therefore denies the same.

# IV. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: Strict Products Liability

19. In answer to Paragraph 19 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow incorporates its answers and response to Paragraphs 1 through 18 above as though fully stated herein and denies all allegations not specifically admitted.

DEFENDANT GREPOW, INC.'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT - 4

20. In answer to Paragraph 20 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow objects to the extent that the allegations contained in Paragraph 20 contain legal assertions and conclusions, which require no response. To the extent a response is required, Defendant Grepow denies each and every allegation contained therein.

21. In answer to Paragraph 21 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow objects to the extent that the allegations contained in Paragraph 21 contain legal assertions and conclusions, which require no response. To the extent a response is required, Defendant Grepow denies each and every allegation contained therein.

22. In answer to Paragraph 22 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow objects to the extent that the allegations contained in Paragraph 22 contain legal assertions and conclusions, which require no response. To the extent a response is required, Defendant Grepow denies each and every allegation contained therein.

23. In answer to Paragraph 23 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow objects to the extent that the allegations contained in Paragraph 23 contain legal assertions and conclusions, which require no response. To the extent a response is required, Defendant Grepow denies each and every allegation contained therein.

24. In answer to Paragraph 24 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow objects to the extent that the allegations contained in Paragraph 24 contain legal assertions and conclusions, which require no response. To the extent a response is required, Defendant Grepow denies each and every allegation contained therein.

25. In answer to Paragraph 25 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow objects to the extent that the allegations contained in Paragraph 25 contain legal assertions and

DEFENDANT GREPOW, INC.'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT - 5

conclusions, which require no response. To the extent a response is required, Defendant Grepow denies each and every allegation contained therein.

- 26. In answer to Paragraph 26 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 27. In answer to Paragraph 27 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 28. In answer to Paragraph 28 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 29. In answer to Paragraph 29 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 30. In answer to Paragraph 30 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 31. In answer to Paragraph 31 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 32. In answer to Paragraph 32 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow objects to the extent that the allegations contained in Paragraph 32 contain legal assertions and conclusions, which require no response. To the extent a response is required, Defendant Grepow denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 33. In answer to Paragraph 33 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow objects to the extent that the allegations contained in Paragraph 33 contain legal assertions and conclusions, which require no response. To the extent a response is required, Defendant Grepow denies each and every allegation contained therein.

DEFENDANT GREPOW, INC.'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT - 6

34. In answer to Paragraph 34 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow objects to the extent that the allegations contained in Paragraph 34 contain legal assertions and conclusions, which require no response. To the extent a response is required, Defendant Grepow denies each and every allegation contained therein.

35. In answer to Paragraph 35 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow objects to the extent that the allegations contained in Paragraph 35 contain legal assertions and conclusions, which require no response. To the extent a response is required, Defendant Grepow denies each and every allegation contained therein.

36. In answer to Paragraph 36 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow objects to the extent that the allegations contained in Paragraph 36 contain legal assertions and conclusions, which require no response. To the extent a response is required, Defendant Grepow denies each and every allegation contained therein.

37. In answer to Paragraph 37 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow objects to the extent that the allegations contained in Paragraph 37 contain legal assertions and conclusions, which require no response. To the extent a response is required, Defendant Grepow denies each and every allegation contained therein.

38. In answer to Paragraph 38 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow objects to the extent that the allegations contained in Paragraph 38 contain legal assertions and conclusions, which require no response. To the extent a response is required, Defendant Grepow denies each and every allegation contained therein.

39. In answer to Paragraph 39 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow denies each and every allegation contained therein.

DEFENDANT GREPOW, INC.'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT - 7

6

1415

16

17

18

1920

21

2223

24

25

#### V. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Defendant Grepow denies Plaintiffs' Prayer for Relief in its entirety, denies all facts not specifically admitted, and denies Plaintiffs are entitled to the relief and damages requested.

### VI. AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

- 1. Failure to Join Indispensable Parties. Plaintiffs have failed to join an indispensable party or parties to this litigation.
- 2. Failure to Mitigate. Investigation and discovery may reveal Plaintiffs failed to mitigate damages, if any, or to avoid injury.
- 3. Apportionment of Fault. Pursuant to RCW 4.22.070 and other applicable law, Defendant Grepow places at issue the proportionate negligence, fault, and responsibility, if any, of all persons or entities contributing in any degree to the damages alleged by Plaintiff. These persons or entities may include Plaintiffs and/or other persons and/or entities to be revealed by discovery. Judgment, if any, against Defendant Grepow should be reduced to an amount representing its proportionate share of Plaintiffs' total damages, if any such damages and liability exist.
- 4. *Misuse*. Plaintiffs,' and/or Plaintiffs' subrogees', misuse and failure to adhere to instructions and warning labels on the product were the cause of Plaintiffs' damages and/or injuries.
- 5. Intervening/Superseding Cause. Plaintiffs' damages are due to supervening or intervening causes, including, but not limited to Plaintiffs' potential misuse of the product.

- 6. Contributory Fault. Plaintiffs' injuries and/or damages, if any, were caused in whole or in part by Plaintiffs', or their subrogees' own negligence, and should be reduced in proportion thereto.
- 7. Foreseeability. The injuries and/or damages alleged by Plaintiffs were not reasonably foreseeable as a result of any of Defendant Grepow's alleged acts and/or omissions.
- 8. Avoidable Consequences. Plaintiffs failed to protect themselves from avoidable consequences.
- 9. No Act or Omission. No act or omission of Defendant Grepow was the proximate cause of Plaintiffs' alleged injury and/or damages.
- 10. Third Party/Non-Party Liability. Plaintiffs' alleged damages, if any, were proximately caused in whole or in part by the acts or omissions of third parties over whom Defendant Grepow has no right of control, and for whom Defendant Grepow has no legal responsibility. As a result, Defendant Grepow has no liability to Plaintiffs, or Defendant Grepow's liability should be reduced by an amount to be demonstrated at trial. The identities of any non-parties will be identified when they are known to Defendant Grepow.
- 11. Reservation. Defendant Grepow hereby reserves the right to assert additional affirmative defenses that may be identified through continuing investigation and discovery in this matter or abandon any affirmative defense herein asserted as future discovery dictates.

///

///

/// 23

/// 24

25

DEFENDANT GREPOW, INC.'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT - 9

7

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

#### VII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, having answered Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant Grepow prays as follows:

- 1. That Plaintiffs' Complaint be dismissed with prejudice and without an award of costs;
- 2. That Defendant Grepow be awarded its statutory costs and attorneys' fees in defending these actions, if appropriate and applicable; and
- 3. That Defendant Grepow be awarded further relief as the Court deems just and equitable under the circumstances and pursuant to applicable law.

Respectfully submitted this 1<sup>st</sup> day of September 2022.

FLOYD, PFLUEGER & RINGER, P.S.

Francis S. Floyd, WSBA No. 10642

Amanda D. Daylong, WSBA No. 48013 3101 Western Ave Ste 400 Seattle, WA 98121-3017 Telephone: (206) 441-4455

Fax: (206) 441-8484

Email: ffloyd@floyd-ringer.com adaylong@floyd-ringer.com

Attorneys for Defendant Grepow, Inc.

## **DECLARATION OF SERVICE**

1

2	Pursuant to RCW 9A.72.085, the undersigned hereby declares under penalty of perjury			
3	of the laws of the State of Washington that on August 30, 2022 she caused to be transmitted for			
4	service a true and correct copy of the foregoing document using the CM/ECF system of the			
5	above-captioned court, which will automatically notify all counsel of record, as well as via			
6	electronic mail as addressed below.			
7	Dogger Toyymaan d	Council for Digitatiff	[ ] Wie Messenger	
8	Roger Townsend BRESKIN JOHNSON TOWNSEND 1000 Second Avenue, Suite 3670	Counsel for Plaintiff Lawrence and Shana Hill	[ ] Via Messenger [X] Via E-Service and/or Email	
10	Seattle, WA 98104 rtownsend@bjtlegal.com admin@bjtlegal.com		[ ] Via Facsimile [ ] Via U.S. Mail	
11	jmcclure@bjtlegal.com jwolfe@bjtlegal.com			
12	Kyle A. Farnam	Counsel for Plaintiff	[ ] Via Messenger	
13	COZEN O'CONNOR 999 3rd Ave Ste 1900	United Services Automobile Association	[X] Via E-Service and/or Email	
14	Seattle, WA 98104-4028 kfarnam@cozen.com		[ ] Via Facsimile [ ] Via U.S. Mail	
15	egilbert@cozen.com klottsfeldt@cozen.com			
16	_			
17	DATED: September 1, 2022.			
18		<i>s/Heather Bullock</i> Heather Bullock, Legal <i>A</i>	\csistant	
19		Treather Bullock, Legal A	Assistant	
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

DEFENDANT GREPOW, INC.'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT - 11

FLOYD, PFLUEGER & RINGER P.S.

3 | O | WESTERN AVE., SUITE 400 SEATTLE, WA 98 | 2 | -30 | 9 TEL 206 44 | -4455 FAX 206 44 | -8484